



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

law" asserted is seen by the adoption of the Porter Proposition and the progress made in the growth of arbitration and in the activities of arbitral tribunals. But the keystone of the nearly completed arch of justice is still wanting; this, Dr. Hill believes, is a mutual guarantee on the part of sovereign states that they will not resort to force against one another, so long as the resources of justice contained in the Hague Conventions have not been exhausted. The establishment of the Court of Arbitral Justice and the prerequisite codification of international law would seem to others the *sine qua non* of permanent peace; while President Taft is seeking it through the development of an international grand jury which shall bring disputants, *volens volens*, into court.

The final impression left by this stimulating treatise is that its optimism as to future international relations is well founded upon the recent enormous extension of international trade and the development of law in the modern state, both of which have greatly facilitated the mutual understanding, and promoted the mutual obligations, of the nations.

WM. I. HULL.

Swarthmore College.

Hinsdale, Mary L. *A History of the President's Cabinet.* Pp. ix, 355. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan, 1911.

After a brief introduction on The Origin of the Cabinet, the major portion of this volume consists of successive accounts of the cabinets of each President, in historical order from Washington to Taft. Though in each administration most space is ordinarily devoted to details surrounding appointments and changes of departmental heads, more significant discussion is introduced where opportunity is discovered for remarking some distinctive change or tendency with respect to the general position of the cabinet in government, its relation to the President, to Congress, or to party politics. These sketches cover an average of six or eight pages each, unimportant cabinets, such as those of Van Buren and Benjamin Harrison, being disposed of in two or three pages, while from fifteen to twenty pages are given to the more eventful cabinet histories of such administrations as those of Jackson and Lincoln.

Following this detailed history, three brief sections embody the author's conclusions on The Principles of Cabinet Making, The Cabinet and Congress, and The Cabinet and the President. This recapitulation appears most effectively under the second topic, where the various formal and informal methods of approach that have grown up between Congress and the Cabinet are sketched clearly and interestingly.

The author seems to have been careful in all particulars, covering the pertinent facts accurately, and manifesting close acquaintance with original and secondary sources. The work for the most part holds closely to the facts, and is dominated by no main hypotheses. Not much of synthetic imagination is employed in the treatment. There is very little of relation to general principles of government or to historical antecedents of our cabinet. Only subordinate reference is made to the political needs that have made the cabinet a natural, if not inevitable, product of custom. The author seems to be concerned with the practices affecting the cabinet rather than with principles and ten-

dencies which these practices reveal, or than with the relations they bear to the general character and efficiency of our governmental organization.

As the plan of the bibliography is comprehensive, there are several notable omissions. For example, among special treatises, Grover Cleveland's "Presidential Problems" and Goodnow's "Principles of Administrative Law in the United States" would seem to have deserved a place. Several recent departmental histories, issued from Washington, are omitted. Gaillard Hunt's "Department of State" (1893) is listed, but not his more recent articles on the same subject in the *American Journal of International Law*. The "Register of Debates in Congress" (1824-37) does not appear in the list of documentary materials; and no reference is made to Van Tyne and Leland's "Guide to the Archives of the United States in Washington."

F. W. COKER.

Ohio State University.

Hobhouse, L. T. *Social Evolution and Political Theory*. Pp. ix, 218. Price, \$1.50. New York: Columbia University Press, 1911.

What is "progress?" How far has it been realized? What are the prospects? The ultra-biologists are wrong in assuming that evolution is necessarily progress. Ethical values are social, not biological; and the sociologist deals only with "the social fact as distinct from the biological and the psychological." Its vehicle is not heredity but tradition: society's achievements. These are psychological, but not exclusively; nor entirely imitative. "Progress is not racial, but social."

The interest shown in eugenics led the lecturer to give two hours to an expansion of his cautions but not hostile critique. Rational selection of the "best" as the "fit," by segregation, through which there is least net misery, is the logical solution of the dilemma between natural and social evolution. But the premises are doubtful. What is social worth? What defects are biological? The elimination of a bad trait may carry with it several valuable traits. Social worth lies in proportion and blending, more than in "unit characters." Social status indicates inertia or social selection, not necessarily degree of biological fitness or social worth. Society must be perfected before the socially undesirable and the biologically unfit are identical. Biology itself holds variations insignificant in heredity, beside mutations. Biological improvement is subject to social progress, which increasingly preserves valuable mutations, and which will add to our knowledge of which variants should be destroyed.

The fatal treadmill of the Theory of Value is avoided by assuming rather daringly that good is in (1) some kind of life, (2) the fuller the better; (3) some form of happiness; (4) some form of self-realization, and (5) the completely social life—all subsumed in the idea of harmony. This modified organism-concept of society depends on the social evolving of intelligence. The social mind, its highest product, adjusts society to its physical environment. Harmonious social growth, like that of the individual, consists in increased scope, articulateness, unity, and self-conscious direction.

"Mutual interest," or "consciousness of kind," in three phases of kinship, authority and citizenship, is the "descriptive formula" (not "law," though the